

## **REMARKS**

Applicant again wishes to thank the Examiner for the consideration given to this case to date. The telephonic interview kindly granted by the Examiner on November 14, 2006 is particularly acknowledged and appreciated. The participants to the interview were the Examiner and the attorneys for Applicant, Gregory S. Kolocouris and Benjamin E. Kern (collectively referred to as "Applicant's counsel"). No other USPTO personnel participated in the telephonic interview.

In accordance with M.P.E.P. § 713.04, a complete and proper recordation of the substance of the November 14, 2006 telephonic interview is as follows:

**(A) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted.**

No exhibits were shown and no demonstrations were conducted during the interview.

**(B) Identification of the claims discussed.**

The participants particularly discussed pending claim 1 of the subject application, but also generally discussed the Examiner's concerns about all of the pending claims.

**(C) Identification of specific art discussed.**

The participants discussed U.S. Patent No. 5,525,008 issued to Wilson ("Wilson").

**(D) Identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary form completed by the examiner.**

The participants discussed amending the claims (e.g., claims 1 and 23) to reflect that the first and second oxidants injected in the claimed process are different from each other.

**(E) The general thrust of the principal arguments of the applicant and the examiner should also be identified, even where the interview is initiated by the examiner. The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is**

**sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.**

The Examiner reiterated his position as set forth in the September 29, 2006 Office Action that Wilson teaches the injection of an oxidant and a pressurized gas. As more fully set forth in Applicant's December 15, 2006 Response to the September 29, 2006 Office Action, Applicant's counsel argued that the subject claims are patentable over Wilson in that, among other things, Wilson fails to disclose at least three separate and distinct injection steps of: a first oxidant; a second oxidant which is different from the first oxidant; and a compressed gas. Instead, Wilson specifically teaches a single injection step involving the simultaneous injection of an oxidant, compressed air, and a metal salt catalyst. At most, Wilson teaches two injection steps of either: (1) a first oxidant and a second oxidant (if the pressurized gas is considered to be an oxidant); or (2) a first oxidant and a pressurized gas (if the pressurized gas is considered to be a means for expanding the zone of influence in the reactive solution).

**(F) A general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed.**

Applicant's counsel also discussed: (1) the different chemical processes utilized in the subject application *vis-à-vis* Wilson and (2) that the Wilson process is incompatible with the process claimed in the subject application.

**(G) If appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary form completed by the examiner.**

The Examiner agreed to consider arguments and/or claim amendments relating to the number of injection steps disclosed by Wilson and the relative identity of the oxidants injected according to the subject application.

**(H) In the case of an interview via electronic mail, a paper copy of the Internet e-mail contents MUST be made and placed in the patent application file as required by the Federal Records Act in the same manner as an Examiner Interview Summary Form, PTOL 413, is entered.**

Not applicable.

## CONCLUSION

No fees are believed due other than the fee for the petition for a one-month extension of time. If additional fees are believed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the additional fees, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-2051, referencing Attorney Docket No. 27566-6.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 5, 2007



\_\_\_\_\_  
Gregory S. Kolocouris  
Reg. No. 47,714

Benjamin E. Kern  
Reg. No. 56,391

BENESCH, FRIEDLANDER  
COPLAN & ARONOFF LLP  
2300 BP Tower  
200 Public Square  
Cleveland, OH 44114-2378  
Ph. (216) 363-4500  
Attorneys for Applicants